



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FILED

09-01-06
04:59 PM

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company
(U-902-E) for Adoption of an Advanced Metering
Infrastructure Deployment Scenario and Associated Cost
Recovery and Rate Design.

Application 05-03-015

**SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
PETITION TO MODIFY DECISION (D.) 05-08-018,
APPROVING SETTLEMENT ON PRE-DEPLOYMENT COSTS**

Vicki L. Thompson
Senior Counsel for:
San Diego Gas & Electric Company
101 Ash Street
Post Office Box 1831
San Diego, CA 92112
Phone: (619) 699-5130
Fax: (619) 699-5027
E-Mail: vthompson@sempira.com

September 1, 2006

**SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
PETITION TO MODIFY DECISION 05-08-018
APPROVING SETTLEMENT ON PRE-DEPLOYMENT COSTS**

In accordance with Rule 47 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) petitions the Commission to modify Decision (D.) 05-08-018, the "Decision Approving Settlement On Pre-Deployment Costs," in connection with SDG&E's Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) proceeding.

In summary, SDG&E seeks the following modifications to D. 05-08-018 (the Decision):

1. An extension of the pre-deployment and bridge funding periods to year-end 2007;
2. Authority to begin limited IT system, system integration and prime services Phase 1 activities in the event that a final AMI decision is delayed beyond March 2007, and approval to recover related expenditures;
3. Authority to establish a new balancing account to track AMI project deployment costs and recovery of these costs in rates.

As discussed below, SDG&E proposes these modifications in order to keep its AMI project on track and at or below budget.

I.

BACKGROUND

On March 15, 2005, SDG&E filed Application (A.) 05-03-015 seeking Commission approval of the company's AMI deployment proposal and associated cost

recovery and rate design (the Application). The Application, in part, requested authority to spend \$50.3 million for AMI project pre-deployment activities.

In a May 9, 2005 Ruling, Commissioner Grueneich established a two-phase procedural schedule - consideration of pre-deployment activities in Phase I and assessment of SDG&E's full deployment proposal in phase II - and directed SDG&E to provide supplemental testimony describing its pre-deployment plan along with a month by month description of all required tasks and costs. Following Commissioner Grueneich's ruling, SDG&E, on May 25, 2005, served supplemental testimony¹ presenting a revised pre-deployment plan that included minimal pre-deployment activities, thereby reducing pre-deployment expenditures from \$50.3 million to \$9.3 million.

Additionally, SDG&E sought authority to begin pre-deployment activities immediately while litigating the merits of its full deployment proposal so that the Company would be poised and ready to begin deployment of its AMI system immediately upon Commission approval of the full deployment proposal. This revised schedule pushed back the IT system design and implementation activities to a later project phase.

Subsequent to filing its supplemental testimony, SDG&E entered into a settlement agreement with other parties regarding the scope of pre-deployment activities. The settlement recommended that the Commission authorize SDG&E to spend \$3.4 million for pre-deployment activities during a "pre-deployment period" extending from September 2005 through March 2006, and an additional \$5.9 million in bridge funding to be spent from March 2006 through the end of that year. On August 25, 2005, the

¹ Sponsored by SDG&E witness Patrick Charles.

Commission issued D. 05-08-018 adopting the settlement. At the time this settlement was executed and approved, SDG&E, Commission staff and the other settling parties anticipated a final Commission decision on SDG&E's AMI application by July 2006.

An important component of SDG&E's pre-deployment plan was to develop and issue five Requests for Proposals (RFP) in the areas of AMI technology, meter installation, information systems and systems integration, and prime services/program management. SDG&E issued the RFPs on October 20, 2005. By the December 1, 2005 deadline for responses, SDG&E had received over 60 proposals from 30-plus vendors. Once received, SDG&E began extensive bid assessment activities, including subsequent meetings to clarify and refine both SDG&E's requirements and vendor proposals.

As the RFP assessment progressed, SDG&E realized that the RFP results provided important data that the Commission should consider when evaluating SDG&E's proposed AMI project. Accordingly, SDG&E filed a motion on October 20, 2005, requesting an extension of the procedural schedule that would allow SDG&E to submit testimony reflecting the RFP results and still provide adequate time for the Commission to issue its final decision before year-end 2006 (prior to the expiration of the pre-deployment funding period). The motion was approved by Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Cooke on November 18, 2005, and SDG&E served its updated testimony on March 28, 2006.

On April 28, 2006, DRA and UCAN filed a joint motion seeking additional time for intervenors to analyze and review SDG&E's updated testimony. In its response to the joint motion, SDG&E expressed concern that further regulatory delay would make it impossible for the Commission to issue a final decision in 2006. As SDG&E pointed out,

this would leave SDG&E without authorized funding in 2007 to support the pre-deployment activities necessary to keep AMI project deployment on schedule. For that reason, SDG&E's response to the motion requested authorization to roll-over the unspent pre-deployment funds into 2007.

In a May 19, 2006 ALJ ruling,² ALJ Gamson granted the DRA/UCAN request for an additional procedural delay, pushing a final decision to February 2007. The Ruling neither accepted nor denied SDG&E request to adjust the pre-deployment and bridge funding periods. Instead, the ruling instructed SDG&E to file a petition for modification of D.05-08-018 by September 1, 2006, if it wished to rollover the pre-deployment/ bridge funding into 2007. Given that the final decision would not be issued until February 2007, the Ruling stated that "it may be reasonable to allow roll-over of unspent 2005/6 bridge funds into 2007" (Ruling p. 4).

II.

DISCUSSION

When the Commission issued D. 05-08-018, the procedural schedule anticipated a final decision by year-end 2006. Parties to the Settlement adopted in the Decision also assumed that the Commission would issue a final decision on SDG&E's AMI application by the end of 2006. Due to the procedural delays discussed above, a 2006 final decision is no longer possible. The current schedule assumes the Commission will issue a final decision in February 2007 at the earliest.

As a result, SDG&E has been forced to modify its pre-deployment schedule. SDG&E now expects to conclude pre-deployment activities, including the field tests of

² Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Granting Motion to Modify the Schedule and requiring Additional Supplemental Testimony.

vendor products and services, by year-end 2007, far later than the schedule contemplated at the time the Commission issued D. 05-08-018.³

Given the size and scope of SDG&E's AMI project, SDG&E must maintain, without interruption, its pre-deployment activities and begin system and system integration work no later than March 2007. Any further delay would seriously jeopardize SDG&E's ability to begin AMI meter installation in 2008 and would, in turn, increase project costs. For this reason, SDG&E seeks the funding flexibility it needs to continue moving the AMI project forward.

A. The Commission should authorize SDG&E to Continue Pre-Deployment Activities and Spending Through December 31, 2007.

SDG&E seeks authority to 1) extend the current pre-deployment period (currently scheduled to end December 2006) through December 31, 2007; and, 2) roll-over (to 2007) any unspent pre-deployment funds remaining as of December 2006, with authority to continue recovering these expenditures through the previously authorized AMIMA⁴ account until the account is replaced by a new AMI balancing account (AMIBA) as described below.

For the reasons discussed above, SDG&E has delayed certain pre-deployment activities and postponed others to remain in sync with the procedural schedule.

Accordingly, SDG&E has spent only \$2.5 million of its authorized pre-deployment budget of \$9.3 million to date, and estimates that it will spend approximately \$7.2 million

³ D.05-08-018

⁴ On April 27, 2005 SDG&E filed Advice Letter (AL) 1689-E/1524-G requesting that the Commission approve a new Advanced Metering Infrastructure Memorandum Account (AMIMA) to record pre-deployment costs incurred as a result of AMI prior to the Commission's approval of SDG&E's AMI Application A. 05-03-015. In Resolution 3937, the Commission approved this advice letter, effective June 30, 2005.

of this total by year end. SDG&E will accelerate pre-deployment spending significantly, however, once field testing and Project Initialization (Phase 0) activities begin in August and September 2006, respectively.

As it stands today, SDG&E's authorization to recover expenses accrued from pre-deployment activity will expire on December 31, 2006. Unless this authorization is extended, SDG&E will be forced to stop all pre-deployment activities at year-end, including its crucial technology field tests.

B. SDG&E Must Be Authorized to Begin "IT" System And System Integration Work On March 1, 2007.

The delay in pre-deployment schedule has resulted in a commensurate delay in deployment activities. SDG&E is scheduled to begin IT system and system integration (IS/SI) work in March 2007, two months later than SDG&E anticipated when it filed the Application. SDG&E cannot begin IT work without assurance that the Commission will permit recovery of the associated costs. Accordingly, the Company is seeking Commission authorization herein to purchase its meter data management system (MDMS) package and begin system integration work by March 1, 2007 if, and only if, the Commission does not issue a final decision in February 2007 as anticipated.

SDG&E seeks this authorization in order to avoid significant project delays in AMI deployment. If the Commission does not issue a final decision in February 2007, SDG&E will not have the funding to begin information systems, systems integration, and prime services/program management (IS/SI/P) activities on March 1st as planned. If IS/SI/P activity cannot begin as scheduled, SDG&E will be forced to stop most project activity. SDG&E will be forced to disband its AMI deployment team so that deployment

personnel and resources do not sit idle while the Commission considers SDG&E AMI proposal.

To avoid such costly delays, SDG&E seeks approval to spend \$49.3 million to purchase and install the AMI IT systems, including the MDMS, on March 1, 2007. This investment would not be “stranded” even if the Commission ultimately rejects SDG&E’s AMI deployment proposal. This is because the MDMS would benefit our customers with or without AMI. A new MDMS that is integrated into the company’s legacy systems would pave the way for better customer service today and act as a foundation for the eventual migration of customers to an AMI-like environment. For example, SDG&E could use the MDMS when installed to process billing information from our C&I customers. In fact, SDG&E has long planned to upgrade its Interval Data System (IDS) (SDG&E’s internally developed MDMS) to enhance the IDS’s ability to process interval data faster and more efficiently for the benefit of customers who could take advantage of time-based rates or programs.⁵ A new MDMS would make the IDS upgrade unnecessary. Further, even if the Commission requires SDG&E to select a different AMI communication system than proposed, the MDMS system will be compatible with any AMI technology ultimately approved.

On the other hand, delaying the purchase of the IT system and installation and integration work beyond March 2007 will be costly already. Already, SDG&E has postponed system and system integration for as long as possible. Further delays will mean higher project costs. This is because SDG&E would be forced to disband project teams, both internal and external, until project funding is authorized in the final decision. Reassembling the project team also will take time, further delaying project completion.

⁵ SDG&E will include funding for IDS enhancements in its 2007 General Rate Case Application.

Indeed, SDG&E may be forced to issue new RFPs as the vendors' contractual obligations to honor price quotes expire and vendor proposals become dated. Issuing new RFPs would be time consuming. It is conceivable that a one month delay in beginning IT work could set back the project back by three or more months. If that happens, the cost to re-start AMI program implementation could well be greater than the incremental funding sought here to cover the minimum project activity.

Funding the AMI system prior to a final decision on the full deployment proposal is not without precedent. In D. 05-09-044, for example, the Commission authorized PG&E to spend \$49 million in capital for pre-deployment activities. In doing so the Commission noted that "it is reasonable for PG&E to expect some assurance of recovery for its costs, given that the Commission has encouraged PG&E to move forward with [the AMI] project..." (D. 05-09-044, p. 12).

The CPUC should reach the same conclusion here for the same reasons. Accordingly, the Commission should authorize SDG&E to begin IS/SI/P activities on March 1, 2007, with assured cost recovery. As the Commission found in the PG&E case, it is reasonable for SDG&E to expect some assurance of recovery for these costs, given that the Commission has encouraged the utilities to move forward with this project.

C. The Commission Should Authorize Balancing Account Treatment Of AMI Expenses.

Finally, SDG&E is seeking permission to recover the system and system integration expenses through a balancing account. SDG&E also seeks authority to record on a monthly basis, capital and O&M related costs in a new AMI balancing account (AMIBA). SDG&E's proposes to replace its existing memo account that currently

records pre-deployment costs with the AMIBA. As stated by SDG&E witness Hansen (July 14, 2006 AMI testimony, Chapter 14, Section 3), SDG&E proposes to record actual O&M and capital-related costs in AMIBA and to make annual adjustments to reflect any variances from the Commission-approved annual AMI revenue requirement. SDG&E also proposes to incorporate incremental changes in AMI Distribution benefits through adjustments to the AMIBA. If AMI meters are installed according to SDG&E's proposed schedule, AMIBA would only be adjusted for O&M and capital-related cost variations; that is, SDG&E would make no additional adjustments to AMIBA to account for AMI Distribution benefit differences. If, however, SDG&E installs more meters than the annual deployment schedule projects, SDG&E will credit the AMIBA with an estimated amount representing the incremental Distribution benefits.

SDG&E does not propose to increase rates as a result of an AMIBA under-collection. Instead, SDG&E intends to carry over the under-collected amount to the next year's balance. The under-collection would be recovered in rates only to the extent that the approved forecasted revenue requirement is not exceeded in total for that year.

VI.

CONCLUSION

If this summer's heat wave has done nothing else, it has confirmed the need for technology that will provide customers with the information they need to respond to price signals and capacity constraints, while, at the same time give utilities the ability to respond quickly to customer outages. AMI deployment will bring these significant benefits to our customers. In order to achieve these benefits on time and at budget, however, SDG&E must be allowed to continue AMI Field Testing and Project

Initialization (“Phase 0”) activities without interruption and to begin information systems, systems integration, and prime services/program management activities on March 1, 2007.

SDG&E is mindful that its AMI proposal represents a large investment, one that merits a full and thorough Commission review. The Commission, however, has directed SDG&E and the other electric IOUs to proceed with AMI. Indeed, the Commission confirmed its commitment to move forward aggressively with AMI when it approved the PG&E’s AMI pre-deployment proposal.

Therefore, the Commission should support SDG&E’s efforts to continue pre-deployment activities by rolling-over the unspent pre-deployment funds through the end 2007. The Commission should also act to protect ratepayers from the cost of unnecessary delays by authorizing SDG&E to spend (and, eventually, to recover in rates) \$50 million to purchase the MDMS system and to perform information systems, systems integration, and prime services/program management work beginning March 1, 2007, in the event that a Commission decision is not issued by February 2006. Certainly, a final decision in

//

//

//

this complex proceeding could be delayed one, two or even three months after the draft decision is issued. This petition allows SDG&E to move forward even if such a delay were to occur.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Vicki L. Thompson

Vicki L. Thompson
101 Ash Street
San Diego CA 92101
(619) 699-5130
(619) 699-5027 facsimile
vthompson@Sempra.com

Attorney for:
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
COMPANY

September 1, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have this day served a true and correct copy of **SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S PETITION TO MODIFY DECISION 05-08-018 APPROVING SETTLEMENT ON PRE-DEPLOYMENT COSTS** to each party of record on the service list in A.05-03-015 via electronic mail. Those parties without an email address were served by placing copies in properly addressed and sealed envelopes and depositing such envelopes in the United States Mail with first-class postage prepaid.

Executed this 1st day of September, 2006 at San Diego, California.

/s/ Lisa Fucci-Ortiz

Lisa Fucci-Ortiz

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Service Lists

Proceeding: A0503015 - SDG&E - FOR ADOPTION

Filer: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

List Name: LIST

Last changed: August 30, 2006

[Download the Comma-delimited File](#)

[About Comma-delimited Files](#)

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

Appearance

SCOTT H. DEBROFF
SMIGEL, ANDERSON & SACKS
RIVER CHASE OFFICE CENTER
4431 NORTH FRONT STREET
HARRISBURG, PA 17110

FREDERICK M. ORTLIEB
OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
1200 THIRD AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

MICHAEL SHAMES
ATTORNEY AT LAW
UCAN
3100 FIFTH AVE., STE. B
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

KATHY CORDOVA
REGULATORY CASE MANAGER
SDG&E AND SOCALGAS
CP32D
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

KELLY M. MORTON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

RENEE H. GUILD
CEO
GLOBAL ENERGY MARKETS
2481 PORTERFIELD COURT
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94040

CHRIS KING
EMETER STRATEGIC CONSULTING
1 TWIN DOLPHIN DRIVE
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

MARC D. JOSEPH
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ADAMS, BROADWELL, JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

NINA SUETAKE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

KAREN P. PAULL
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION

711 VAN NESS AVE., STE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

ROOM 4300
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

PAUL ANGELOPULO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5031
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHRIS KING
CHAIR, SVLG DEMAND RESPONSE SUBCOMMITTEE
224 AIRPORT PARKWAY, SUITE 620
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

JUSTIN BRADLEY
DIRECTOR ENERGY PROGRAMS
SILCON VALLEY LEADERSHIP GROUP
224 AIRPORT PARKWAY, SUITE 620
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

Information Only

PATRICK J. FORKIN III, CPA
SENIOR EQUITY RESEARCH ANALYST
TEJAS SECURITIES GROUP, INC.
7700 BONHOMME AVE., SUITE 575
CLAYTON, MO 63105

CHRIS HICKMAN
CELLNET TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
4085 SUDBURY ROAD
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80908

HUGH YAO
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 W. 5TH ST, GT22G2
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

ANDREW SHIRLEY
IVORY CAPITAL GROUP, LLC
100 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 1830
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401

CASE ADMINISTRATION
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
ROOM 370
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

JANET COMBS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

VICKI L. THOMPSON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET HQ13
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

DONALD C. LIDDELL
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
2928 2ND AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

EPIC INTERN
EPIC/USD SCHOOL OF LAW
5998 ALCALA PARK

SCOTT J. ANDERS
RESEARCH/ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO SCHOOL OF LAW

SAN DIEGO, CA 92110

5998 ALCALA PARK
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110

CENTRAL FILES
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP31E
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

PATRICK CHARLES
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
8330 CENTURY PARK CT.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

WENDY KEILANI
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK CT. CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

KEVIN GOLDEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ADAMS, BROADWELL, JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

TANYA GULESSERIAN
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD. STE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

BRUCE FOSTER
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, STE. 2040
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

MARCEL HAWIGER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

DEVRA WANG
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

GREG CHANG
BLOOMBERG NEWS
345 CALIFORNIA ST., STE 3500
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

BONNIE W. TAM
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B8R
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

DAVID ROCHEFORT
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET MC B29R
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

JULIANNA GASSMAN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., MC B8R
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

JUNE RUCKMAN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC B8R
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

KAREN MOGLIA
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B10A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

LARRY NIXON
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC B10A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
517-B POTRERO AVE.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

LAW DEPARTMENT FILE ROOM
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120-7442

TONY FOSTER
ITRON INC.
1111 BROADWAY, STE 1800
OAKLAND, CA 94607

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1999 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1440
OAKLAND, CA 94612

DAVID MARCUS
PO BOX 1287
BERKELEY, CA 94701

JEFF NAHIGIAN
JBS ENERGY, INC.
311 D STREET
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA 95605

TOM D. TAMARKIN
UTILITIES SERVICES CUSTOMER LINK
2737 EASTERN AVENUE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821

ROGER LEVY
LEVY AND ASSOCIATES
2805 HUNTINGTON ROAD
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864

State Service

RALPH E. ABBOTT
PLEXUS RESEARCH, INC.
629 MASSACHUSETTS AVE
BOXBOROUGH, MA 01719-1528

ANDREW CAMPBELL
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
ROOM 5304
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

BRUCE KANESHIRO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHRISTOPHER J. BLUNT
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID M. GAMSON
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 2251
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

EDGAR A. QUIROZ
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JOSEPH A. ABHULIMEN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JULIE A. FITCH
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING
ROOM 5203
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

LOUIS M. IRWIN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MARSHAL B. ENDERBY
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MICHAEL ROSAUER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MOISES CHAVEZ
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NILGUN ATAMTURK
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
ROOM 5303
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROBERT KINOSIAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ORA - ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SCARLETT LIANG-UEJIO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

THOMAS M. RENAGHAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MIKE MESSENGER
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET, MS-28
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

[Top of Page](#)

[Back to INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)